

REMARKS ON THE SPECIFIC NAME OF THE BANDED DUIKER.  
Z.N.(S.) 1908By Hans-Jürg Kuhn (*Anatomisches Institut, Frankfurt am Main*)

1. Bennett (1832, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*: 122–123) gives a good and unequivocal description of an imperfect skin of a banded duiker (specimen no. 55.12.24.294 British Museum (Natural History)). He calls it "so beautiful an animal" and says "it may not improbably belong to some species of Antelope, . . .". He does not name it.

2. Ogilby (1837, *Proc. zool. Soc. London* 1836 : 12–121) refers to this description by Bennett (1832) when naming *Antilope doria*, "the beautiful species mentioned by Mr. Bennett" "which is a real Antelope". However, by lapsus he gives a wrong reference ("Proc. Zool. Soc.", 1833, p. 1", in this page Bennett describes and names *Antilope mhor*). In my opinion it is absolutely clear, however, that Ogilby did not want to refer to *Antilope mhor* because:

(a) he would not have called the plain-coloured *Antilope mhor* a "beautiful species";

(b) *Antilope mhor* was described from a specimen that had been living in the London Zoo. There was no question that it is a "real Antelope";

(c) there would have been no reason whatsoever to apply a new name to *Antilope mhor*.

3. In the "Echo du Monde Savant" Robert or Gervais describe the banded duiker as *Antilope zebra* according to Sclater and Thomas (1894) and Allen (1939). The date of publication is given as "1836" but it does not seem to be clear. I have not been able to trace the "Echo du Monde Savant" of 1836. It may antedate both Ogilby (1837) and Gray (1838).

4. Gray (1838, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (1), 1 : 27) describes another imperfect skin of a banded duiker (specimen no. 38.4.16.327 British Museum (Natural History)) and names it *Antilope zebra*.

5. Up to 1939 nearly all the authors actually working on the banded duiker or writing pertinent monographs or handbooks or revisions have used "*doria* Ogilby, 1836" (for 1837) or "*doriae* (sic!) Ogilby, 1836" for the banded duiker (Waterhouse 1838; Wagner 1844; Reichenbach 1845; Fraser 1849; Jentink 1885, 1887a, 1887b, 1892; Büttikofer 1890; Thomas 1892; Ward 1892; Lydekker 1893; Sclater & Thomas 1894). Only Gervais (1840, 1855) used "*zebrata*" Robert or Gervais, ?1836; and Gray himself (1843, 1850a, 1850b, 1852, 1872), Sundevall (1847) and Lesson (1842) used "*zebra* Gray, 1838". (This list may be incomplete).

6. Knottnerus-Meyer (1907, *Arch. f. Naturgesch.* 73 (1) : 46) made *Antilope doria* Ogilby, 1837 the type species of the subgenus *Cephalophula* for the banded duiker.

7. Sundevall (1847), Allen (1939) and Ansell (1970) consider *Antilope doria* Ogilby, 1837 to be a junior objective synonym of *Antilope mhor* Bennett, 1833. They considered the reference given by Ogilby (1837) as more important than the context (see paragraph 2). They have been followed by a number of authors after 1939. Kuhn (1965, 1966) uses *doria* Ogilby, 1837 for the banded duiker.

8. It is proposed that the International Commission should

(a) correct the obvious lapsus by Ogilby (1837) by substituting "*Proc. zool. Soc. London* 1832, p. 122–123" for "*Proc. Zool. Soc. 1833, p. 1*" in the first line of page 121 in *Proc. Zool. Soc. London* 1836. (This would extinguish all doubts about the availability of *Antilope doria* Ogilby, 1837 as the specific name for the banded duiker. It would be in the best interest of stability of nomenclature. It would also remove any doubts about the availability of *Cephalophula* Knottnerus-Meyer, 1907 as a generic name for the banded duiker);

(b) make sure about the status and date of publication of *Antilope zebra* Robert

or Gervais, 1836 and place this name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, because it has not been used for more than 100 years as far as I know;

- (c) not place the specific name *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria* on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, as proposed by Ansell (1970, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 27(2) : 104).

## REFERENCES

- ANSSELL, W. F. G. 1970. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 27(2) : 104.  
SCLATER, P. L. & O. THOMAS. 1894. *The book of antilopes*. I, London.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES  
FOR *RYBAXIS* SAULCY, 1876. Z.N.(S.) 1882  
(see volume 26, page 166)

By Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University*)

Considering the fact that the name *sanguineus* has been used for a species of pselaphid beetles for 150 years and that the *sanguineus* of authors had been selected by Jeannel as the type of the genus *Rybaxis*, it would seem simpler to select the type of *Bryaxis longicornis* as the neotype of *Pselaphus sanguineus* Illiger since the history of the last 150 years shows that the existence of the same specific name in the two beetle families is not apt to cause any confusion. The fact that Illiger, Fabricius, and Reichenbach attributed the name to Linnaeus becomes irrelevant as soon as the neotype is designated.

UNNECESSARY NEOTYPES: A COMMENT ON *HYPOCEPHALUS*  
*APRUGNUS*, Z.N.(S.) 1916

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Agr. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.*)

This application (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 27 : 113-114, 1970) illustrates the undesirable results of unnecessary designation of a neotype. When original type material is subsequently discovered, the case must, under Article 75f, be submitted to the Commission, and thus must go through the protocol of a publication in the Bulletin, publication of any comments, preparation of a Voting Paper by the Secretariat, voting by the Commission, preparation of an Opinion by the Secretariat, and publication of the Opinion. This entire concatenation of prescribed but time-consuming and costly procedures is totally unnecessary and unjustified if the neotype itself is unnecessary and unjustified.

Judging from the information given, the present case does not appear to satisfy the general qualifying conditions for neotypes (Art. 75c), such as topotypic material, apparent loss of the original type, and deposit of the neotype in an appropriate scientific institution. The real crux of the matter, however, is whether the neotype is even admissible under Article 75a. I have examined the publication by Štys (1964) and find no evidence that the case of *Hypocephalus aprugnis* involved any "exceptional circumstances" whatsoever. A neotype was not "essential for solving a complex zoological problem"; no such problem existed! There was no problem of identification, and the existence of a good series of topotypes made possible an extensive and detailed redescription of the species. A neotype was not needed, and should not have been named. The present application should not have been necessary.

I maintain that the neotype designated by Štys (1964) is inadmissible and hence invalid under Article 75a. To recognize it is to demean and to undermine that provision of the Code. But if the Commission should consider that an official ruling is desirable, in order to obviate any future doubts, then I favour a ruling that the neotype is inadmissible, that the present proposal is accordingly denied, and that full recognition is accorded the original holotype.